

diode and of said fourth diode is connected to anodes of
said first diodes and said second diodes, respectively;

*As per
Amend*
a load-dependent DC voltage source having a first connection
and a second connection; and

said third diode and said fourth diode each having a second
terminal respectively connected to said first connection and
said second connection of said load-dependent DC voltage
source.

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-7 remain in the application. Claim 5 has been
amended.

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office
action, the Examiner stated that the drawings had been
objected to as noted in attached form PTO-948.

Counsel does not presently have a copy of form PTO-948 and
respectfully requests that the Examiner mail another copy so
that the drawings can be corrected in accordance with the
objections therein.

In paragraph 2 on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claim 5 has been objected to as being in improper dependent form.

Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations defined by claim 1.

In paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The allegedly indefinite terms "the circuit configuration have been eliminated from claim 5.

Support for the terms "coupled to a DC voltage connection" can be found by referring to the regulating voltage connection E_R shown in Fig. 2 and described in the specification at page 9, line 25 through page 10, line 9.

The specification has been amended to more particularly describe the "load-dependent DC voltage source". Support for the changes can be found by referring to Fig. 2, to claim 5, and to the specification at page 11, line 14 through page 12, line 3. It is believed that no new matter has been added to the specification.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved.

In paragraph 3 on page 4 of the Office action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-4 have been allowed.

In paragraph 4 on page 4 of the Office action, the Examiner indicated that claims 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The indication of allowability is greatly appreciated and it is believed that the rejections have been overcome.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 5. Claims 1 and 5 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 5, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 5-7 are solicited.

Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account No. 12-1099 of Lerner & Greenberg, P.A.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark P. Weichselbaum
Reg. No. 43,248



For Applicants

MPW:cgm

Date: November 13, 2000

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101